Document 40

Filed 03/27/2008

Page 1 of 5

Case 3:07-cv-05696-SI

27

28

1	Additional Attorneys for Plaintiffs, who will submit applications for admission <i>pro hac vice</i> :
2	
3	J. Nelson Thomas, NY Attorney No. 2579159 Patrick J. Solomon, NY Attorney No. 2716660 Michael J. Lingle, NY Attorney No. 3925765
4	Annette Gifford, NY Attorney No. 4105870
5	Justin Cordello, NY Attorney No. 4131447 DOLIN, THOMAS & SOLOMON LLP
6	693 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14607
7	Telephone: (585) 272-0540 Facsimile: (585) 272-0574
8	nthomas@theemploymentattorneys.com
9	Charles H. Saul, PA State Bar No. 19938 Liberty J. Weyandt, PA State Bar No. 87654
10	Kyle T. McGee, PA State Bar No. 205661 MARGOLIS EDELSTEIN
11	525 William Penn Place Suite 3300
12	Pittsburgh, PA 15219 Telephone: (412) 281-4256
13	Facsimile: (412) 642-2380 csaul@margolisedelstein.com
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

1

## **NOTICE OF MOTION**

2

3

TO DEFENDANTS AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT Plaintiffs hereby administratively move for an Order continuing the date for the scheduled Initial Case Management Conference in this matter until after the Court's ruling on the motions to remand pending in two related matters pursuant to Local Rule 7-11. This Motion is based on this Administrative Motion, the Declaration of Annette Gifford and Proposed Order filed herewith, all records and files in this case, and the arguments, if any, of counsel.

## PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONTINUE CONFERENCE

Previously, this Court has ruled that the instant action ("Bryant I") is related to two other pending actions, Helm, et al. v. Alderwoods Group, Inc., et al., Case No. 08-1184-SI ("Helm") and Bryant, et al. v. Service Corporation International, et al., Case No. 08-1190-SI ("Bryant II").

Currently, a case management conference in *Bryant I* is scheduled for Monday, April 7, 2008 (the "Conference"). See Bryant I, Docket No. 39. On March 18, 2008, this Court issued and Order to Show Cause indicating that the Court intends to consider at the Conference the issue of whether any of the three related matters should be transferred to the Western District of Pennsylvania. See Bryant I, Docket No. 37; Bryant II, Docket No. 32.

On March 24, 2008, plaintiffs filed motions to remand both the *Helm* and the Bryant II matters to state court. See Helm, Docket No. 29<sup>1</sup>; Bryant I, Docket No. 34. Hearings on both of those motions are currently scheduled for May 9, 2008. See Helm, Docket No. 43; Bryant I, Docket No. 34. Plaintiffs previously set out the procedural history of these cases in their response to the *sua sponte* referral for determination of relationship of cases in the *Helm* matter. *See Helm*, Docket No. 28.

This motion was subsequently re-noticed, following the Court's determination that the Helm matter is related to Bryant I and Bryant II. See Helm, Docket No. 43.

14

Date: March 27, 2008

23 24

25 26

27

28

In light of plaintiffs' motions to remand, and in light of the Court's inquiry regarding whether certain matters should be transferred to another District Court, plaintiffs request that the Conference be continued until after this Court's ruling on the motions to remand. The issue of this Court's subject matter jurisdiction over the two state law actions is a threshold issue which must be determined before this Court takes any other action with respect to these cases. Plaintiffs also submit that the any other case management issues that would be addressed at the Conference may be more efficiently addressed only after this Court has determined whether it has subject matter jurisdiction over the Helm and Bryant II actions.

On March 26, 2008, plaintiffs' counsel met and conferred with defendants' counsel by telephone to determine whether the parties could reach a stipulated agreement regarding plaintiffs' requested continuance. At that time, defendants' counsel indicated that defendants will object to plaintiffs' request.

The schedule currently set out would be an inefficient use of judicial resources as it would require the Court and the parties to engage in a Conference regarding case management issues prior to the time the Court has determined, by ruling on plaintiffs' pending motions for remand, whether it may exercise subject matter jurisdiction over those matters. Thus, plaintiffs' request is in the interest of judicial economy.

Respectfully Submitted,

ROSEN, BIEN & GALVAN, LLP

By: /s/ Lori Rifkin

Sanford Jay Rosen, State Bar No. 62566 Maria V. Morris, State Bar No. 223903 Lori E. Rifkin, State Bar No. 244081 315 Montgomery Street, Tenth Floor San Francisco, ČA 94104 Telephone: (415) 433-6830

1 2	DOLIN, THOMAS & SOLOMON LLP J. Nelson Thomas, NY Attorney No. 2579159 Patrick J. Solomon, NY Attorney No. 2716660 Michael J. Lingle, NY Attorney No. 3925765
3	Annette Gifford, NY Attorney No. 4105870 Justin Cordello, NY Attorney No. 4131447
4	693 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14607
5	Telephone: (585) 272-0540
6 7	MARGOLIS EDELSTEIN Charles H. Saul, PA State Bar No.19938 Liberty J. Weyandt, PA State Bar No. 87654
8	Kyle T. McGee, PA State Bar No. 205661 525 William Penn Place, Suite 3300
9	Pittsburgh, PA 15219 Telephone: (412) 281-4256
10	Attorneys for Plaintiffs
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	3
	PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONTINUE CONFERENCE  Case No. CV 07-5696 SI

Case 3:07-cv-05696-SI Document 40 Filed 03/27/2008 Page 5 of 5